

Application No. 10/824,983  
Amendment Dated December 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2006

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Application No. 10/824,983  
Amendment Dated December 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2006

### REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed October 16, 2006, claims 1-4, 6-9 and 13-20 have been rejected, claims 5 and 10-12 have objected to, and claims 21-40 have been withdrawn. In response, the Applicants have submitted the following remarks, amended the abstract, amended Figure 1, amended claim 1, cancelled claims 5 and 21-40, and added claims 41 and 42. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-20 and 41-42 are now pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

### Election/Restrictions

Within the Office Action, the Applicants' election without traverse of Group I including claims 1-20 was confirmed, and further that claims 21-40 were withdrawn. By the above amendment, the Applicants have cancelled claims 21-40, and hereby reserve the right to pursue these claims in a separate divisional application.

### Drawings

Within the Office Action, the drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 35 C.F.R. §1.84 (e)(5) because they do not include the reference "system 10" mentioned in the description. In response, the Applicant hereby submit the corrected Figure 1 drawing sheet with the appropriate reference sign "10". The Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

### Specification

Within the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because it contains the phrase "of the invention" which can be implied. By the above amendment, the Applicants have removed this phrase from the abstract. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9, 13 and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0230456 to Lorzier et al. (hereinafter Lorzier).

Further, within the Office Action, claim 5 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if re-written in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the above amendment, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 5. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lorzier.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 13, and 15-20 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lorzier. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 13, and 15-20 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 6, 8 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorzier. Claims 3, 6, 8 and 14 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lorzier. Accordingly, claims 3, 6, 8 and 14 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Allowable Subject Matter and New Claims

Within the Office Action, claims 5 and 10-12 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As discussed above, claim 5 has been cancelled, and the limitation of claim 5 have been amended into the independent claim 1. Claims 10-12 are dependent upon the

Application No. 10/824,983  
Amendment Dated December 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2006

independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lorzier. Accordingly, claims 10-12 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The new independent claim 41 includes the limitations of claim 10, all of the limitations of the base claim 1, and the limitations of intervening claim 9. Accordingly, the new independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lorzier.

The new independent claim 42 includes the limitations of claim 11, all of the limitations of the base claim 1, and the limitations of intervening claim 9. Accordingly, the new independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lorzier.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at 414-271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By:   
Christopher M. Scherer  
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, St. 1100  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
(414) 271-7590  
Attorney Docket No. 146462 (5024-00124)